

TOWN OF IPSWICH
Finance Committee
Meeting of April 9th, 2019
Town Hall, 25 Green Street

With a quorum present, the Chair called the meeting to order at 7:34.

Finance Committee members present: Chair Janice Clements Skelton, Tammy Jones, Kevin Murphy, Jamie Fay, Walter Hartford, Michael Schaaf, Rob White, Chris Doucette

Not present: Michael Dougherty

1. Citizens Queries – Janice Clements Skelton

- Phil Goguen, King Fisher Road, asked about appropriation and what it means in the context of the warrant. Janice said it means we will be earmarking dollars for that particular usage either from the budget or from one of the other funds if otherwise indicated. Phil read the definition of appropriation as put forth by the state, and it should be for specific public purposes and is usually limited to an amount and a time period. Janice said that definition sounds consistent with how the town uses the term. Phil then read the definition of bond appropriation. He then referred to an article that was approved for \$2M in a previous warrant and then the article was changed before the bonding. Phil wants to know what happened to that. Janice asked Phil to forward that information to her so she can look into it and get back to him about it.

2. Acceptance of Finance Committee Minutes

- 3/26 minutes will be approved at next meeting.

Warrant Hearing

Article 20: Al Benson 41 High Street, submitted Articles 20 and 21. Al explained article 20 and its goal. A lot of the lots on High street are dual-zoned lots which was originally intentioned for barns so was zoned for agricultural land. The current rule allows for people to build on the IR portion of the lot which allows for a big change of character in one of the biggest historic areas of town as it will create new development. Al noted that new developments would also strain the schools and water. Janice asked to make sure she understood this correctly. As it stands now, if properties were to change hands and a developer were to purchase it, they would be able to calculate the density based on the entire lot even though the buildable land is only in the IR portion. This would allow for larger, multi-family buildings in these historic areas of town. Janice said this article is intended to ensure that in a situation with dual zoning that the density is only based only on the amount of area that falls within in-town residential. It just limits it to the actual land footprint, does not change the in-town residential rule. Al said this is correct and it is a footnote that related specifically to the divided lots and would only effect lots with RRA (rural, residential, agricultural) zoning. It's about 53 lots in Ipswich. 17 are on Farley Ave, 34 are on High Street and East Street. Al will go before the planning Board on Thursday but he has already spoke with Ethan Parsons. Someone has already been to court about something similar but Al said this is different. Michael S. clarified that this is 53 lots, Al said approximately. He asked what the Planning Board has said so far. Al said Ethan is not opposed to this idea but he is concerned about possible legalities. It has to go in front of the Planning Board on Thursday. Michael said Town Meeting typically discusses zoning in the fall and the Planning Board usually takes the lead on this. He also said he is concerned about a sweeping change just because there is concern over one lot. Al said it is not just about this one lot, it is about a pro-development board and he doesn't believe that the things being passed currently have been benefiting the community. With special permits, a lot has been approved lately. Special permits need to prove the benefit to Ipswich, Ipswich isn't supposed to have to prove that it is not a benefit. Ipswich has been very pro-development and Al doesn't think this is good and is taxing all of our resources and is not improving the town. Jamie thanked Al for bringing this issue forward and thinks this is a good question for the town. Having lots zoned with two different zones is problematic and he agrees with the implications of this for the character of the lots. He complimented Al on bringing this forward, although he doesn't know how he stands personally on this issue. Jamie said in general this board seems to be in favor of new development and new projects, so he is conflicted on this. With respect to high street though, Al has raised a good point about the character. Tammy said that this seems like a loophole that needs to be tightened and she is looking forward to how this will come out. Al said his concern is that people will sell these as a lot for multi-units because they

will make a lot more money than selling it as a single family. Janice said the only problem is that tonight is the night for voting, and they don't have the benefit of the Planning Board's opinion. The options are to vote tonight or to Recommend at Town Meeting (RATM). Kevin said this is a very valid bi-law that he thinks we should vote on tonight. The town has always felt that high street is important to the community and is also an economic engine as people come to see these homes. These properties could be in danger and he supports this and appreciates Al bringing it forward. Michael made a motion to RATM this. He said he does not think the Finance Committee should make a vote on this without the opinion of the Planning Board. Seconded by Robert. He would also like to see a map that shows this. Tammy said she is very much in support of this and would like to vote on this tonight but in keeping with precedence they need to hear from the Planning Board. Jamie said sometimes these bi-laws are written and then are used not in the way that it is intended. He is concerned about the specific language and is interested to hear what the Planning Board has to say. Janice said she is in the same boat, she strongly supports this but is more concerned about language. She wants to make sure we are going forth with the best language so it doesn't get opposed because of a technicality. The FinCom members will listen on Thursday night to the Planning Board Meeting and will RATM this.

→Vote: Motion passed, 7-1. Kevin opposed.

Janice said Al is welcome to send them more information but FinCom cannot deliberate about this. Janice said she cannot emphasize strongly enough how important the map will be at Town Meeting.

Article 21: Al also presented Article 21, which focuses on increasing parking requirements for residential spaces to two spaces from the current 1.5. When someone is building a complex with very large units that cost half a million dollars, there should be 2 cars. With a special permit, you can even have .75 spaces per unit. This is not realistic and is creating parking issues in town. Tammy said she is guessing that 1.5 parking spots is old legislation when people didn't have as many cars and she would like to publicly encourage the Planning Board to look at this. Walter said there might be some areas where less parking spaces are acceptable. Al said there is an avenue for that by special permit. Walter said we need to be thoughtful about this and about how we want the town to be. He applauds Al for bringing this up. Janice said this is straight forward and no language is being changed other than the number being changed from 1.5 to 2. Jamie said this is more complicated because it affects everything and increases costs of housing because it will increase the need for more parking. He also said that a lot of towns are creating parking space maximums to encourage public transportation and less use of cars. He does not support this. Michael said he shares Jamie's thoughts about this. It is a significant change in zoning that will affect a lot of potential projects. He thinks that it is important to understand from the Planning Board if this is a big issue or not and would like to look for the Planning Board for guidance on these matters. Michael moved to RATM this item, Tammy seconded. Walter said he thinks it makes sense to get the Planning Boards thoughts on this, especially because this affects downtown. Robert is in favor of this but he is concerned how this impacts downtown.

→Vote: Motion passed 7-1, Kevin Opposed

Article 23: Phil Goguen presented Article 23. It is a repeat of an article that was proposed last year regarding term limits. He asked if the Finance Committee had any questions. This is a follow up from the indefinite postponement. Jamie asked what the problem is that Phil is trying to solve. Phil said we have a situation in the country where we have term limits and we have folks that get into elected office and people feel that they are entitled. Phil said he believes that fresh eyes and fresh ears are important. Jamie said he does not agree that this is a problem that needs to be solved. He also asked about the number and said it is not in the motion. Phil said it would be three consecutive terms which would be 9 years. Jamie said Phil should work with the Town Moderator because it doesn't say a number in the article. Phil said this is the same way it was written last year. Janice said one of the reasons it was indefinitely postponed was because it was too vague. Janice said she does support term limits in general but it needs to be a balance, she isn't sure what the number should be. She does not support this the way it is worded as of now because it is not clear enough. Phil said the wording can change and the number can change. He isn't expecting this to go through right away. He also said that the reason he is proposing this is because he didn't feel he was being treated fairly when coming to meetings. He started attending other towns meetings and saw how other towns treated their citizens. Janice said that there are resources in town that are intended to help Phil craft this so it has the appropriate language. Motion to oppose made by Robert, seconded by Michael. Robert said he doesn't see the problem that Phil is identifying because we do have frequent elections in town and new board members are always coming. Janice said the objection is more about the construction of the article and the lack of specificity. Kevin said he does favor term limits in some cases but he is concerned about the wording because this is asking for the town's opinion. It is difficult to support this in its current condition.

→Vote: Motion opposed unanimously, 8-0

Article 24: This article regards the town conducting quarterly audits. Jamie asked Phil what the problem is that he is trying to solve with this article. Phil said currently there is a once a year audit that lasts an hour or two. Internal audits would be done more frequently by our own people. This will allow for problems to be addressed quicker and easier. This will also be easy to conduct due to the Open Checkbook article that passed. Janice said what Phil is recommending is a process change. She asked for Sarah's opinion. Sarah said the accountant, treasurer, and herself review all of the finances monthly. It is one of the reasons they are able to do audits so quickly. The town has had a clean audit and they run very tight and very well. The accountant looks at everything every month and she sends out monthly reports to all of the departments, which the department heads sign off on. Sarah does not believe quarterly audits are needed. Michael asked Sarah if we have had any issues regarding financial theft of any sort. Sarah said previously, before Sarah arrived, there had been situations in the schools. She doesn't know anything about this on the town side. Phil has brought concerns to Sarah and she has looked into these concerns and hasn't found anything. Phil recommended Open Checkbook so there is financial transparency, and we have done that. Michael asked if the town has received any management letters about any findings of inadequate accounting. Sarah said no and we have had clean audits. Rob said there were a few minor issues with a grant, Sarah said the federal grant audits have been clean. Michael asked how much time each quarterly audit would take if we were to do this. Sarah said it depends on how deep they would go and how much of a report they would want. She said it could be about a week of time for her and the accountant for each audit. Chris said he trusts Sarah and her team to run a very tight ship. In the language, it talks about internal audits. It sounds like we have monthly internal checks and balances, but audits should be done externally always. So quarterly external audits would be very expensive, and do not seem necessary. There are a lot of eyes watching the money and this is not a big business. He does not support this. Walter said audits are usually done by an external source. Internal doesn't make sense because Sarah would just be checking her own work. Phil said he thinks it could be as simple as department heads checking each other's books. It would just be another set of eyes checking it. Phil said we may not know if there have been problems in the past. Tammy voted to oppose, Seconded by Robert.

→Vote: Motion opposed unanimously, 8-0

Article 25: Janice asked how this differs from School Dude. Phil said it will be easier with Open Gov. Janice asked what inventory Phil is looking to capture. Phil said it would be for all purchases under \$10,000. Jamie asked Sarah for her view on the value of this article. Sarah said the reason it is under \$10,000 is because of the GASB 35. Anything under \$10,000 would take too much time and too much money to track. We would have to hire somebody full time to audit this. We do track all purchases over \$1,000. For purchases under \$1,000 it is usually best practice. Janice asked how we know what has been purchased. Sarah said everything goes through the accounting department and every invoice is reviewed by between 5 and 6 people. Phil said other companies have specific software to control inventory. Motion to oppose made by Rob, seconded by Tammy.

→Vote: Motion opposed unanimously, 8-0

Article 15: Robin Hogan, 80 Essex Road. Article 15 proposes a change in the Hearing authority from the Select Board to the Chief of Police. The basis for this is that nonsense and dangerous dogs are a public safety issue and the thought is the department in charge of public safety should be in charge of this. Chief Nikkas said when looking at other towns, some chiefs do this and some select boards do this. He would be fine doing this. Chris asked how many times this is brought forward per year. Chief Nikkas said in the last 9 years he has seen this happen one time. Jamie asked what other towns do and how this works in Ipswich. Robin said a written complaint has to be submitted to the Town Manager. Once this is sworn in by the Town Manager it initiates the investigation process. The animal control officer makes a recommendation, that recommendation is given to the chief, and the chief then presents to the Select Board. Michael asked what the problem is. Janice said that when it did happen it was a difficult situation and there were some questions about whether or not the Select Board was the right board to be handling this. Motion to approve made by Tammy seconded by Walter.

→Vote: Motion opposed unanimously, 8-0

Article 14: Chief Nikkas said there isn't language about a barking dog in the bi-laws. Right now, it is not clear how the town can deal with a barking dog. The department would like to have the authority to go and check on the dog to make sure it's okay, as well as to address the owner to give a warning and then fines. Chris said he thinks this will give people a way to deal with this without having to have a conversation with a neighbor. Tammy asked about the timeline. Chief Nikkas said this is a way to open the conversation and get the ball rolling. Michael asked how this improves what is done now. Chief said there is no actual language right now for barking. We mimic state laws right now but we don't have a

town bi-law. It is formalizing the language to make the process less formal. Michael made a motion to support, seconded by Rob.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously, 8-0

Article 11: Presented by Tom Murphy, Town Moderator. This article is in regards to electronic voting. This bi-law amendment brings the bi-law into the 21st century to allow for electronic voting. Janice said this gives sole authority to expend funds that are not identified yet. Although it is free this time, in the future it will not be. Janice said she has concerns with this because it gives the decision to do this without determining where the funding will be coming from after the free trial year. Tom said this just allows use of it, it does not touch on funding. Janice asked why we need to amend the bi-law if the moderator has the right to do this. Tom said it was George's suggestion just to update the law. Michael asked why we are moving to electronic voting. Tom said it doesn't have to do with speed. He has noticed that a lot of people have been uncomfortable with the 2/3 show of hands voting and this would put concerns to ease. Tammy said she thinks that this would be expensive once we have to purchase it and she doesn't see the need for it. Tom said towns nearby also use the same system so we could share if we need more than the 500 we would purchase. That would require the Select Boards of the towns to coordinate dates. Chris said he thinks the conversation we are having is about electronic voting, isn't about changing the bi-law. He also said that Tom is saying this change is not necessary for us to move forward with the electronic voting try. Janice said she doesn't think this is necessary at this time. Jamie said he supports the article and thinks it's better to have the proper language included. He doesn't think he would support spending the money to purchase electronic voting, but giving the option is okay. Chris said he thinks the town should be able to vote for electronic voting. Motion to support made by Chris and seconded by Walter.

→Vote: Motion passed, 5-3. Janice, Robert, and Tammy opposed.

Article 18: Craig Saline presented Article 18 which is about updating the Town Charter to make the language gender neutral. It is not changing the meaning, intent, or scope, simply pronouns. Jamie asked how FinCom can vote on this if they do not have the specific language. Janice agreed that they do not have the specific language and cannot vote on this. Michael said he thinks a RATM would be belaboring it and moved to support the article. Seconded by Kevin. Jamie said he thinks it is bad practice to vote on things we haven't seen. This happened last year as well. Craig said the language is the same as in the October meeting. Jamie said the problem is that we don't have it.

→Vote: Split 4-4. Janice, Chris, Jamie, and Walter opposed.

Article 19: Craig said this article is meant to approve a report being presented at Town Meeting. At the last Town Meeting the Government Study Committee said they would do further research, so they would like to present this research to the town. Jamie said he was impressed with the report that was made on the research and he thinks the Town should hear this. Motion made by Robert, seconded by Chris. Michael asked why this report should be presented to the town when a lot of reports are made by boards that are not presented. Janice said she believes it is because it was requested. Craig said they felt there was a request to present this information.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously, 8-0

Article 17: Janice said her understanding was that the Select Board was going to look to see if this should be continued on the warrant. Craig said he hasn't heard. Janice said she would like to hear the Finance Committees thoughts on RATMing this once they hear the Select Boards opinions since it most directly affects them. Michael asked if Janice had discussed this with Nishan. Janice said they discussed it during Bean Counting and it seemed there was questions with the language and on the scope. The Select Board meets again on 4/22. Walter said there was a lot of discussion that happened at Bean Counting that made him think that FinCom should not vote on this yet. Janice said there are enough open questions from the Select Board, and the Finance Committee would like to hear the opinion of the Select Board first. Craig said there is a lot of wordsmithing happening and the language can be interpreted and wordsmithed in a lot of ways, but more importantly, we have to get started on this. It is important for the town to get the ball rolling. The GSC understands the importance of how it is worded, but they don't want to see it get derailed. Janice said they are not necessarily going to fall in line with whatever the Select Board decides, they just want to have their decision as a factor in their decision making. Michael asked why the Finance Committee can't voice their opinion about this regardless of the opinions of the other boards. Jamie said he thinks it is kind of like FinCom taking an opinion on a zoning article without asking for the opinion of the Planning Board. It is common sense and courtesy to get the opinion of the Select Board first since it most directly affects them. Craig said he is trying to push this so that a dialog can get going between now and Town Meeting. He thinks that FinCom possesses the right to have an opinion about what the Select Board does just as much as the Select Board.

Walter said he supports the intent of what is needing to be accomplished. Jamie said FinCom can make a RATM and say that they support the concept but would like to hear the opinions of the Select Board first. Rob asked for clarification on what this is for. Craig said that we need to look at how we are positioned to handle upcoming plans and how the four boards are going to work together to tackle future needs of the town. This will make a new way of doing long-term planning. This will ensure that these boards are in the room at the same time to discuss future plans and make sure plans are not disruptive of each other. Rob voiced concern about the Select Board running projects for the school for example. Craig said the Select Board would be leading the planning for the processes, but would not be leading the projects. Gary Champion, 3 Palomino Way, said the bi-laws say that once opened, a warrant should remain open for at least 7 days. If the Select Board felt there was a need to keep this open at the next meeting, we will be continuing to push this out. Ipswich Town council in September 2018 email includes wording that this can be changed in the charter if the town wishes. It is clear that this is a charter matter. This change makes it clear what the responsibilities of the Select Board are and also pulls boards together for long term planning. Gary said if FinCom supports this, it would encourage the Select Board to also move forward with this. All questions have been answered and we have the best possible language, and he believes the GSC deserves the support of the Finance Committee. Michael said he would like to make a motion to RATM this out of respect for the Select Board, but would also like to note that the Finance Committee is in support of this. Tammy seconded. Robert said he agrees with this but is not sure we need to identify the Select Board as the leaders for thinking on this. He does not support the communication to the Select Board that we approve the structure. Jamie suggested we divide the motion into two parts, Janice said she would support that. Motion made by Jamie to separate the motion into two motions, seconded by Walter. Michael asked why. Jamie said the people on the board don't all agree with all aspects of the motion Michael made. Janice agreed, you can support the motion to RATM without supporting the other aspect. Michael wanted to point out to the committee that the original motion said general. Michael withdrew his motion, seconded by Tammy. Michael moved to RATM this article with the intention of hearing the position of the Select Board, seconded by Tammy.

→Vote: Motion passed, 6-2. Chris and Kevin opposed.

Michel moved to communicate the to the School Board, the Planning Board, and the Select Board that the Finance Committee generally approves this.

→Vote: Motion passed, 4-3. Opposed Janice, Jamie, and Rob.

Articles 16: Hannah Wilbur, Open Space Manager spoke to Article 16 which is to change the appointment terms to the Open Space Committee Members from 1 year to 3. Changes include language and edits. The Moderator has been the point of authority in this and it will now be the Town Manager. Jamie asked why this is being proposed. Hannah said initially people got together and said it would be less of a hassle to do this every 3 years. Hannah said Glenn Gibbs suggested the point of authority should be moved from the Town Moderator to the Town Manager just to make it easier. Janice went over changes, dropping the requirement of refreshing this plan every 5 years. Hannah said this has changed and is not every 7 years in accordance with the state. Jamie asked if this needs to be submitted by the Select Board. Hannah said she will learn more about this process after Town Meeting but that is her understanding. Jamie said the wording might need to be changed. Hannah said the intent is that the Open Space Committee are the authors of this plan and then would present for approval by the Select Board. Janice said the language should be changed before it is voted on. Hannah said this is the same language that has been in place since 2,000. Janice also said number two should also be rephrased to clarify the role of the Conservation Committee. Chris said this warrant has a lot of language that does not pertain to the actual warrant. Janice said there seems to be enough changes that need to be made that she recommended to indefinitely postpone to give Hannah time. Motion to indefinitely postpone made by Chris and seconded by Rob. Jamie said he thinks there is enough time for them to get it done before Town Meeting. Janice said it would be cleaner and easier to give them plenty of time to figure this out and not make changes at Town Meeting. Kevin asked what really needs to be changed. Janice went over some concerns. Jamie said we have a lot of RATMs and we have to keep things moving. He said the idea behind this warrant is a good one. Janice said she agrees with that but she cannot support it as it stands. Tom said if the warrant is not posted, which he doesn't think it is, Hannah can make these edits now and move the article as re-written. Tom also voiced his concern about putting something on the warrant and then taking it off on the floor and said it doesn't reflect well on us. It doesn't send a good message. His recommendation is if it can be salvaged do it.

→Vote: Split 4-4. Kevin, Walter, Jamie, and Tammy opposed.

Jamie moved to support article 16 and request clarification on the legal process for approving the plan, seconded by Tammy. Janice said she has other questions so she won't be supporting this and she doesn't know why we are rushing to get this done. These questions are likely going to be asked at Town Meeting and why not clarify these answers ahead of time.

→Vote: Motion split, 4-4. Rob, Janice, Walter, and Chris opposed.

The Finance Committee would like clarification on who submits the actual plan.

Article 22: Hannah discussed the disposition of land at rear Old Right Road as written in the article. Rob asked why the state wants the land. Hannah said they own the parcels around it and they were supposed to own it so it just tidies it up. Rob said the State Rep said the state is going to pay us less for the pilot payment. Jamie said this is very close to a parcel of land that we looked at three years ago in which the owner of the land wanted to give land to the town, and the town decided we didn't want it. The parcel was mostly wetlands and could have been contaminated so it was of no value to Ipswich. Kevin said that property is up the street further north. Tammy asked if there is any reason for Ipswich to want to keep it. Jamie asked if we give it to the state and if we are trying to convert land for Article 97, the state usually wants something to trade for it. Perhaps this would qualify. Jamie asked what the assessed value is. Hannah said it is assessed at \$24,000. It is land locked and is inaccessible. It is entirely wetlands as well, so is not buildable. Michael asked if we could have liability if someone gets hurt on the land. Chris asked if the Planning Board is suggesting to give this away. Hannah said the Land Disposition and Acquisition Committee submitted this to the Town Manager after the state requested this land. The Town Manager brought this to the Select Board to decide if we would like to gift this property. Janice asked if the town is indemnified if the land is gifted and any contamination is found. Jamie said it is unlikely that it would exist, and if it did exist it is unlikely that it would be found. Hannah said she would need to look into it more, but she doesn't think it would qualify for Article 97 because it has to be something comparable. Jamie said he is just suggesting that maybe this could be banked so we could get credit for it in the future if ever needed. Tom said there is wording in the warrant that says "subject to conditions" and there are no conditions listed. Hannah said there should be conditions listed. Janice said this is not complete. Jamie made a motion to support the article with the revision that the state should pick up the transfer costs, seconded by Michael. Chris asked why we would get rid of it. Tammy said the original intent was not for us to own it, and it is not of any value to us and it could be a liability.

→Vote: Motion passed, 5-3. Chris, Rob, and Janice opposed.

A discussion ensued about whether or not to convene a short second hearing to re-vote the items that have been RATMed. Jim Engel, 363 Linebrook Road, suggested to move to continue the hearing to the 23rd, without adjourning.

Article 1: Janice went over Article 1 as presented in the warrant. Sarah said tony is looking for a way to have a revolving fund for the boardwalk. We are looking for a vehicle to have a revolving fund to fix the boardwalk. Right now, the limit is \$5,000. This is the first step in the process. Jamie said this is diverting general revenues to little projects and these belong in the Capital Plan. Kevin asked why this is separate. Sarah said that revolving funds now have to be approved via a bi-law. Kevin said this sounds backwards, he would assume you would create the policy first and then ask for the money. Janice said if we need a boardwalk it belongs in the Capital Plan. Jamie moved to support Article 1 with the deletion of sub-part L. Seconded by Chris.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

Article 2: Jamie moved to appoint Walter Hartford in the running for Finance Committee. **Seconded by ___**

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

Article 3: Municipal Budget. Rob said he has never seen a municipal report without the numbers in it. Sarah said we usually put it in the motion but we usually have the motions by now. Jim said you can vote this now without the number, just warn people that this will happen. Michael asked about wording and noted that concern over the wording has been brought up before. Continuing this discussion on the 23rd.

Article 4: Will be discussed on the 23rd.

Article 5: Rob asked about the language "greater than or less than". Jim said it means that if it comes in higher, we have warned the town of the possibility. Motion to support this article, seconded by Michael.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously.

Article 6: Motion to support by Jamie, seconded by Rob. Sarah said this number won't be known until the fall. Kevin asked for last year's total from Sarah.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 7: \$219,118. Motion to accept made by Rob. Seconded by Walter. Sarah said currently there is \$2.3M in the Educational Stabilization Fund. There will be \$2.5M but it will come back down because some will be used.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 8: \$100,000. Sarah said there is \$161,000 in the fund currently. Tammy said Special Education outplacement costs are extraordinary so it makes sense to have a buffer. To get money out of this SpEd fund it is a vote from the School Committee and the Select Board. Tammy moved to approve, seconded by Rob.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 9: Janice referred to the list on the warrant article. Kevin said the committee hasn't met since December. This list is of the needs and regardless of what goes forward with the plan, these items have been on the capital plan for the last four or five years. Jamie asked if the windows for the library could be paid for by the Green Communities. Kevin said they would have to apply by October, if and when we become a part of the Green Communities. Chris said Jamie has a good point that this list has some items that could be covered by a program and should we wait. Kevin said that we have to demonstrate to Green Communities that we have been actively updating our buildings. Jim said his understanding is that as soon as we join Green Communities we will get \$140,000 automatically. Kevin said there are \$140,000 of windows that need to be replaced at the Library and the Town Hall. Michael said perhaps we should delay implementation of these items until the Green Communities matter has been resolved. Rob asked about the leases in regards to the new Facilities Manager and the School Dude assessment and whether we should pre-pay these leases. Kevin said they didn't talk about it but he did make it clear that FinCom was not happy about paying leases with Free Cash and have not been receptive to this operation. Rob asked about the technology for the switches. Kevin said he thought that was for user equipment. Sarah said Tony delayed a DPW vehicle, he pushed it out because he wants to purchase and not lease. Michael said they have \$150,000 in capital improvements to two schools we are seeking to replace and wanted to note that we are still having to put money into these schools. Not to replace the roof, but to find leaks and repair. The \$150,000 was lower than what they were originally looking for. Motion to support Article 9 made by Jamie seconded by Tammy.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 10: Michael asked about the quality of the number. Jim said this number is to replace the water main to the water treatment plant. The project is to the point where we have a fairly solid number. Jamie asked if there were any alternatives considered. Jim said no. The condition of the pipe was evaluated. Motion to support made by Michael, seconded by Tammy. Rob asked what the increases are for. Jim said this is the water, so it is the 15% increase and another 15% next year.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 12: Motion to support made by Kevin, seconded by Tammy. Sarah said we like to take money from Free Cash and move to Stabilization to build up Stabilization. \$1.768M currently. Rob asked if state aid has been increased in the budget, Sarah said no.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

Article 13: Motion to support made by Rob and seconded by Walter.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously

9. New/ Other Business

- none

10. Adjournment – Janice Clements Skelton

- Motion to continue hearing to April 23rd at 7:30 so these votes can be revisited. Seconded by Rob.

→Vote: Motion passed unanimously, 8-0

Respectfully Submitted By
Alyson von der Esch
4.23.19